Exhibit D

```
1
                  IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                      NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
2
                             EASTERN DIVISION
3
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                  Plaintiff.
4
                                            No. 01 CR 567-2
 5
        VS.
                                            Chicago, Illinois
    FRANK RODRIGUEZ,
 6
                                            May 2, 2002
                                            2:12 o'clock p.m.
 7
                  Defendant.
 8
               TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Change of Plea
                BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES F. HOLDERMAN
 9
10
    APPEARANCES:
11
                                  HON. PATRICK J. FITZGERALD
    For the Plaintiff:
                                  United States Attorney
12
                                  219 South Dearborn Street
                                  Chicago, Illinois 60604
13
                                  (312) 353-6117
                                  BY: MR. CHRISTOPHER D. NIEWOEHNER
14
                                  VILLALOBOS & ASSOCIATES
    For the Defendant:
15
                                  BY: MR. RAUL VILLALOBOS
                                  1620 West 18th Street
16
                                  Chicago, Illinois 60608
                                  (312) 666-9982
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
                       COLLEEN M. CONWAY, CSR, CRR
                        219 South Dearborn Street
24
                               Room 2144-A
                         Chicago, Illinois 60604
25
                              (312) 435-5594
```

```
1
        (Proceedings in open court.)
 2
             THE CLERK: 01 CR 567, United States versus Rodriguez.
 3
             MR. NIEWOEHNER: Good afternoon, your Honor.
             Chris Niewoehner on behalf of the government.
 4
 5
             MR. VILLALOBOS: And Attorney Raul Villalobos on behalf
 6
    of Frank Rodriguez, Judge.
 7
             THE COURT: Good afternoon.
 8
             Good afternoon, Mr. Rodriguez.
 9
             THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, your Honor.
             THE COURT: Mr. Rodriguez, have you had enough time to
10
    look over those materials now?
11
12
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
13
             THE COURT: All right. What is your desire?
             THE DEFENDANT: I wish to plead guilty, your Honor.
14
15
             THE COURT: All right. You understand that you are
    still under oath, under the oath that was administered to you
16
17
    earlier in these proceedings? Do you understand that?
18
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
19
             THE COURT: Do you wish to change any of the answers to
20
    any of the questions that I earlier asked you?
21
             THE DEFENDANT: No, I do not, your Honor.
22
             THE COURT: All right. Are you satisfied with the
    advice and efforts of your attorney on your behalf?
23
24
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
25
             THE COURT: And have you had enough time to talk with
```

cap, it's a minimum, because he wanted to know if he could --

```
THE COURT: Well, did you -- I know, I understand it.
1
 2
    Did you --
             MR. VILLALOBOS: Yes.
 3
             THE COURT: -- explain that to him?
 4
             MR. VILLALOBOS: Yes, I did.
 5
             THE COURT: When you told him --
 6
             MR. VILLALOBOS: Yes.
 7
             THE COURT: -- there is no cap, there is, in fact, a
 8
          In fact, we're going to have that cap established on this
 9
    record before we complete these proceedings.
10
             Now, when you told him there is no cap, what did you
11
12
    mean?
             MR. VILLALOBOS: Well, there is no cap as far as a --
13
    you don't plead guilty to a particular number of years here.
14
    He's not pleading to nine years or six years. That will be
15
16
    determined by your Honor.
             THE COURT: And that's what you told him?
17
             MR. VILLALOBOS: Well, along with reading the plea
18
    agreement. And that at the end, after the sentencing, they will
19
    dismiss Count 2 and there would be no trial. He won't present
20
    witnesses. We can't make any other motions. We can't -- he'll
21
    won't be seeing the testimony against him. He's basically --
22
    he's pleading to the indictment, Count 1, and I read through the
23
    indictment of Count 1.
24
```

THE COURT: Did you answer any questions that he had

about Count 1?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VILLALOBOS: Yes. We answered a lot of questions. We talk for probably I think at least two or three days on questions as to the allegations in Count 1. In fact, we took it sentence and even word per word.

THE COURT: Is that true, Mr. Rodriguez?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: Did your lawyer answer all the questions that you had regarding the charge in Count 1?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions now about the charge in Count 1?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I do not.

THE COURT: Do you understand that Count 1 allegedly charges a conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute and the distribution of mixtures containing cocaine base, also known as crack? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand the conspiracy allegedly began in late May of 2001 and continued until about June 20th, 2001?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that a conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to do something that the law prohibits?

obtain the attendance of witnesses, and your counsel would have a right to cross-examine any witnesses called by the government and call witnesses on your own behalf.

Do you understand that?

23

24

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that at trial you would be presumed to be innocent and the government would be required to prove you guilty by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt before you could be found guilty and you would not have to prove your innocence at all? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that at any trial, while you would have a right to testify if you chose to testify, you also have a right to not testify and no inference or suggestion of guilt could be drawn from the fact that you did not testify in the case? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now, the trial could either be a jury trial or a trial by a judge without a jury. However, if the trial were a trial by a judge without a jury, the judge, yourself, and the government would all have to agree to that procedure.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if there was a jury trial, that you would proceed before a jury that's composed of 12 persons selected under the laws of the United States? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And you understand that you and your attorney would have an opportunity to exclude certain people from sitting on that jury for two basic reasons. One is by exercising what is called a challenge for cause, which means if any prospective juror is shown to not be able to be fair in your case, they would be excluded from sitting on the jury.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And you understand that you also could exclude people from sitting on the jury by exercising what are called peremptory challenges. The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure allow you a certain number of peremptory challenges, which means you can exclude that certain number of people from sitting on the jury without having to give any reason why you don't want those people on the jury.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, do you understand also that the trial could be a trial before a judge without a jury? Do you understand that?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And if that is the circumstance, the judge, yourself, and the government would all have to agree to that procedure before it was followed.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Now, if it was a jury trial, once the jury was selected, the jury would have to agree unanimously, would consider each count of the indictment separately, would consider each defendant on trial separately in making its unanimous determinations.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Do you understand that the jury would make those determinations after hearing all the evidence, after hearing the arguments of your counsel and the government counsel, and also hearing the jury instructions on the law that the judge would read to the jury? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that at any trial, whether it'd be a trial by a judge without a jury or a jury trial, the judge or the jury would be guided by the rule which requires that your guilt be proven beyond a reasonable doubt?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And if your guilt is not proven beyond a reasonable doubt, then the jury or the judge would have to return a verdict of not guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if at trial you were found guilty, you would have a right to appeal from any legal errors committed at the trial? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you plead guilty, you are waiving all of these rights that I have explained to you? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that by pleading guilty, you are abandoning any pretrial motions or objections that have been made or could be made on your behalf to any of the District Court proceedings? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you plead guilty and I accept your plea, there will not be a trial in your case and I will enter a finding of guilty and sentence you on the basis of your plea after considering a presentence investigation report and after hearing from your counsel, the government counsel, and yourself here in open court before I make a final determination as to the appropriate sentence in your case? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, I have before me a document entitled Plea Agreement. It contains a signature of an individual, Frank Rodriguez.

```
Is that your signature on the tenth page of this plea
1
2
    agreement?
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is, your Honor.
 3
             THE COURT: Now, before you signed the plea agreement,
4
5
    did you read it over?
6
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes.
             THE COURT: You hesitated when you answered that
 7
    question. Do you need more time to read it over?
8
             THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
9
             THE COURT: Is there a reason you hesitated?
10
             THE DEFENDANT:
11
                             No.
             THE COURT: Did you discuss the plea agreement with
12
    your attorney?
13
14
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.
             THE COURT: And are there any other promises or any
15
    other agreements that have been made to induce you to plead
16
17
    guilty to Count 1 in this case that aren't set forth in this
    written plea agreement?
18
    THE DEFENDANT: What was that, your Honor? Could you
19
20
    repeat that again, please.
             THE COURT: Yes. Have any other agreements or any
21
    other promises been made to you to cause you to plead guilty
22
    that aren't in this written plea agreement?
23
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             No.
24
             THE COURT: Is your decision to plead guilty entirely
25
```

voluntary on your part?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, there are a couple of parts of the plea agreement that I want to specifically ask about. We will get into the maximum penalties which are, in fact, the cap that the government and I must abide by in determining an appropriate sentence.

But in paragraph 10, you agree that money paid to the members of a conspiracy as part of the undercover investigation, commonly referred to as "buy money," in the amount of \$3,000 will be ordered to be paid by you jointly and severally with your co-defendants, Pedro Castillo and Alfredo Barrera, as a condition of your supervised release.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: There is no waiver of right to appeal, is there?

MR. NIEWOEHNER: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: There is no waiver of the 2255 --

MR. NIEWOEHNER: That's also correct.

THE COURT: -- rights? And it is agreed under paragraph 15 of the agreement that at the time of sentencing, each party is free to make any recommendation it deems appropriate, correct?

MR. NIEWOEHNER: That's correct, your Honor.

MR. VILLALOBOS: That's correct. 1 THE COURT: All right. And you understand that, Mr. 2 3 Rodriguez? THE DEFENDANT: Oh, yes, I do, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Now, the government has agreed to dismiss 5 the remaining count of the indictment at the time of sentencing 6 as well, which your counsel mentioned. 7 Do you understand that? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: All right. So the sentence, you 10 understand, could be up to the maximum penalties imposed, that 11 could be imposed under the statute if this case were tried, even 12 on this plea of guilty if that is appropriate, under a proper 13 application of the United States sentencing guidelines? Do you 14 understand that? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: All right. Are there any other specific 17 aspects of the plea agreement that we should specifically 18 mention before we talk about what those maximum penalties are? 19 No, your Honor. MR. NIEWOEHNER: 20 MR. VILLALOBOS: No, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Rodriguez, do you understand each of 22 the terms in each of the paragraphs of the plea agreement? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 24

THE COURT: Mr. Villalobos, do you believe your client

understands each of the terms in each of the paragraphs of the plea agreement?

MR. VILLALOBOS: I do believe it, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask, then, for the government to tell us what the maximum penalties are that could be imposed under the statute.

MR. NIEWOEHNER: Your Honor, under the statute, with regard to Count 1 to which the defendant will plead guilty, the maximum penalty is a penalty of life imprisonment and it carries a mandatory minimum sentence of ten years' imprisonment, a maximum fine of \$4 million, a term of supervised release of at least five years and up to any number of years, including life, as well as any restitution ordered by the Court, and there is a hundred-dollar special assessment.

THE COURT: Do you understand, Mr. Rodriguez, that you could be sentenced up to life in prison? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you understand that you must be sentenced to at least ten years in prison? Do you understand that? That's the minimum mandatory sentence. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Also, you could be fined up to \$4 million. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And following any term of imprisonment, there is a requirement that you be placed on supervised release for at least five years, and that supervised release term could be up to the rest of your life? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So what that means is even though you'd already been in prison once for whatever the period of time is, at least ten years as part of the sentence, after you're released from prison, you'll be on supervised release and you must comply with the conditions of your supervised release, and if you fail to do so, you could be put back in prison for the remaining portion of the supervised release period? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Also as part of the sentence, I must order restitution. You have agreed to pay the \$3,000 jointly and severally with your co-defendants.

Let me just ask the government, is there any other restitution the government will be seeking?

MR. NIEWOEHNER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Also, as the Assistant U.S. Attorney indicated, there's a special assessment that must be imposed of \$100. I have no discretion in that regard. That must be imposed.

And I see pursuant to the last sentence of paragraph 9 you agree to pay that special assessment of \$100 at the time of sentencing. Do you agree to that? Paragraph 9, page 7, last sentence.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I need to make sure that the record is clear on this.

Has anyone forced you in any way to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has anyone threatened you in any way to cause you to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: And apart from this plea agreement, have any promises been made to you to cause you to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is your decision to plead guilty entirely voluntary on your part after discussing the matter with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have any promises been made to you by your attorney or anyone else regarding sentencing other than what we have talked about here?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: You do understand that the final decision as to what your sentence will be rests with me? Do you

understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask the government, then, to briefly summarize what the evidence would be with respect to Mr. Rodriguez's involvement in the crime charged in Count 1 if this case were tried.

MR. NIEWOEHNER: Your Honor, the government's evidence would show that from in or about late May 2001 until on or about June 20th, 2001, at Chicago and elsewhere, in the Northern District of Illinois, Defendants Alfredo Barrera and Pedro Castillo did conspire with each other and with others known and unknown to the grand jury knowingly and intentionally to possess with intent to distribute and to distribute controlled substances, namely, in excess of 50 grams of mixtures containing cocaine base, also known as crack, a Schedule II narcotic drug, controlled substance, in violation of Title 21 U.S.C. Section 841(a)(1) and Title 18 U.S.C. Section 2.

Specifically, in late May or early June 2001, a confidential informant working with the Federal Bureau of Investigation spoke with defendant about purchasing quantities of cocaine and marijuana. Defendant told the CI that he could supply either narcotic and agreed to provide the CI with samples.

On June 4th, 2001, defendant gave the CI samples of powder cocaine and marijuana. Defendant had obtained the sample

of cocaine he gave to the CI from Pedro Castillo.

Over the next few days, the CI and defendant had a series of conversations in which defendant agreed to supply the CI with three ounces of crack cocaine in exchange for \$3,000. Defendant arranged with Castillo to supply the three ounces of crack cocaine in the anticipated deal. In turn, Castillo arranged with Alfredo Barrera to supply the crack cocaine from a relative of Barrera's.

On June 7th, 2001, the CI spoke with Castillo who confirmed that the deal for three ounces of crack would take place that day. Defendant and the CI then drove to 3328 West 65th Place, Chicago, Illinois, where Castillo resided in a rented basement apartment. There, defendant and the CI met Castillo and Barrera. Castillo and the CI remained at the basement apartment for several hours while Castillo cooked about three ounces of powder cocaine into approximately 72.3 grams of crack cocaine. Defendant and Barrera stayed with Castillo and the CI for most of that period, leaving only for short errands. After Castillo finished preparing the crack, he gave it to the CI and took \$3,000 in exchange. Shortly before the CI and the defendant left the basement apartment, Castillo agreed with the CI that they would do future deals together. Defendant and the CI then left the basement apartment together.

Defendant was arrested on July 27th, 2001. When he was arrested, defendant was carrying two baggies containing powder

cocaine, a total of .97 grams, and 28 Ritalin pills, 2.8 grams, methylphenidate hydrochloride. Defendant was keeping 67 grams of marijuana in his family's refrigerator. Defendant also had a black shoulder holster with a magazine holder, a magazine with nine rounds of ammunition, a plastic gun case, and a gun-cleaning rod in his bedroom.

The government's evidence would show that on or about April 10th, 2002, the defendant wrote and sent a letter from the Stevenson County Jail addressed to individual B that contained information that was intended to be given witness A in the case. Witness A had introduced the defendant to the CI in this case.

In the letter, the defendant asked witness A to visit him at the Stevenson County Jail. In the letter, the defendant said that if witness A did not contact him by a certain date, "I will call my three brothers and my six cousins. From there, it will get very ugly. Once they find out I'm going to prison, I can't control unless witness A helps me. Believe me, it's no joke. These guys don't play, and there's nothing you or the FBI or cops or even God can do about it."

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rodriguez, you have heard the statement of the Assistant United States Attorney as to what the evidence would show. Is that statement correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: Is there any part of the statement that you disagree with?

(Defendant conferring with his attorney.)

THE DEFENDANT: The part from the letter.

THE COURT: The part from the letter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right. What is it about the part from the letter that you disagree with?

THE DEFENDANT: Because this part is from the whole letter. You have to read the whole letter. It's -- he only took a part in there, where he's putting it in like to like a bodily threat from when I see how they put it.

THE COURT: So you could see from the part that the Assistant U.S. Attorney read that a person could interpret it as a threat?

THE DEFENDANT: The person -- yeah, depending who reads the letter, yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. But you're saying that the letter ought to be read in its entirety for context in order to understand the full meaning of the letter?

THE DEFENDANT: Exactly.

THE COURT: All right. So if I for purposes of determining whether I should accept the guilty plea for Count 1 exclude from my consideration any reference to the letter and I read the letter myself before I determine the appropriate sentence, would that be agreeable with you if you persist in your plea of guilty?

```
THE DEFENDANT:
                            Yes.
1
            THE COURT: All right. Does the government have a copy
2
3
   of the letter?
            MR. NIEWOEHNER: I do, your Honor. I don't have a
4
5
   clean copy --
6
            THE COURT:
                        Okay.
            MR. NIEWOEHNER: -- to hand you up, but I will --
7
            THE COURT: Could you prepare a clean copy, provide a
8
9
    clean copy to defense counsel.
            And, Mr. Villalobos, I am going to order you to make a
10
    copy within 24 hours of your receipt of that letter.
11
            Why do you keep looking up at the ceiling?
12
            MR. VILLALOBOS:
                             I'm not.
13
            THE COURT: Are you listening to me?
14
            MR. VILLALOBOS: Yes, your Honor.
15
             THE COURT: Within 24 hours of receiving the copy of
16
    the letter that the government is going to provide you, you are
17
    to provide it to Mr. Rodriguez.
18
             Do you understand?
19
             MR. VILLALOBOS: Yes, your Honor.
20
             MR. NIEWOEHNER: If it's of some assistance, your
21
    Honor, that copy of that letter was given to Mr. Rodriguez in
22
    the package of materials that the government tendered both
23
24
    times.
```

THE COURT: Twice.

MR. NIEWOEHNER: Yes. 1 2 THE COURT: Have you seen the letter, Mr. Rodriguez, in 3 the materials? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: Well, then we don't have to give you 6 another copy. That's the letter, right? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. THE COURT: So I'll just ask the government to give me 8 9 a copy. 10 MR. NIEWOEHNER: And I would prefer to get a clean copy 11 for your Honor. 12 THE COURT: That's what I want. I want a copy that is 13 in the same condition as when Mr. Rodriguez sent the letter. 14 MR. NIEWOEHNER: And I will, it will be done. It's in evidence right now. I'll need to get it out to make a clean 15 16 photocopy, but I will --THE COURT: By "in evidence," you're talking like an 17 18 agent. You mean --19 MR. NIEWOEHNER: Yes, yes. 20 THE COURT: -- it's in some way been maintained so that 21 the evidentiary chain of custody has been preserved? MR. NIEWOEHNER: That's exactly correct, your Honor. 22 23 THE COURT: All right. You don't have a clean copy in the office that you can copy? 24

MR. NIEWOEHNER: When they copied it, they cut off a

corner, and so I need to get the --

THE COURT: I appreciate the conscientious way you're addressing that. If you could do that and then give me the clean copy, then you can return it to the evidence preservation area.

I am not going to consider any part of the proffered evidence today regarding the reference to the letter. I am going to review the letter myself before I determine the appropriate sentence, and I will hear from you, Mr. Rodriguez, and your counsel as to anything you want to tell me about that letter.

Other than the reference to the letter, do you disagree with any part of the statement?

THE DEFENDANT: You mean that what it says, actual -- about --

THE COURT: What the Assistant U.S. Attorney just said, other than the reference to the letter.

He made a reference to the letter. You disagreed with that reference. I am not going to consider that for purposes of determining whether there's a factual basis for your guilty plea here today, but if you plead guilty, I will use that to determine the appropriate sentence as part of the consideration that I have, and you want me to, right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So other than the

letter, do you disagree with any part of the statement that's been made here by the Assistant U.S. Attorney regarding your involvement in the crime charged in Count 1?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: All right. Are you, in fact, guilty of the crime charged in Count 1?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Then, Mr. Rodriguez, bearing everything in mind that we have discussed here today with regard to this charge, what is your plea with regard to Count 1 of this indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Since you have acknowledged that you are, in fact, guilty and there is a sufficient factual basis for the guilty plea that's been proffered here today, and since you have had the assistance of counsel, you know what your trial rights are, you know what the maximum possible punishment is, and you are voluntarily pleading guilty, I will accept your plea of guilty, enter a finding of guilty on the plea.

I am going to order a presentence investigation report to be prepared. I am going to ask my clerk to suggest a sentencing date that would allow sufficient time for that report to be prepared, reviewed, and commented on by counsel and Mr. Rodriguez before I rely upon it.

THE CLERK: August 20th.

All right. My clerk has suggested August THE COURT: 1 Can everybody be here at that time? 20th. 2 MR. NIEWOEHNER: Yes, your Honor. 3 That's a Tuesday. THE COURT: 4 MR. VILLALOBOS: Yes, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. August 20th at 1:30. 6 My clerk will also give you a schedule that will be 7 part of the minute order from today's proceedings that you 8 should comply with so that we can proceed with sentencing in 9 this case regarding Mr. Rodriguez on August 20th at 1:30. 10 Anything else we need to take up now? 11 No, your Honor. MR. NIEWOEHNER: 12 No, your Honor. MR. VILLALOBOS: 13 THE COURT: All right. We will see you on August 20th. 14 15 Thank you. (Proceedings concluded.) 16 CERTIFICATE 17 I, Colleen M. Conway, do hereby certify that the 18 foregoing is a complete, true, and accurate transcript of the 19 proceedings had in the above-entitled case before the Honorable 20 JAMES F. HOLDERMAN, one of the judges of said Court, at Chicago, 21 Illinois, on May 2, 2002. 22 23 Official Court Reporter, 24

United States District Court Northern District of Illinois

Eastern Division